



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,211	07/11/2001	Yoshiaki Hiratsuka	2500.65689	9972
7590	06/14/2007		EXAMINER	
Patrick G. Burns, Esq. GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD. Suite 2500 300 South Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60606			SEFER, AHMED N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2826	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/903,211	HIRATSUKA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	A. Sefer	2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2-6 and 9-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 2-6 and 9-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species I (fig. 3 and claims 2-6 and 9-14) and sub-species B in the reply filed on 3/19/2007 is acknowledged and claims 8, 7 and 15-21 have been cancelled.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. The indicated allowability of claims 2, 9 and 10 are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Nagai ("Nagai") USPN 6,359,390 and Yoshinaga ("Yoshinaga") USPN 6,492,587. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nagai.

Nagai discloses 1-9 a display panel module comprising a display panel 10 defining a screen on a front surface; an electrically conductive frame 20 enclosing the display panel; and an electrically conductive member 16 located behind the display panel and electrically connected to the electrically conductive frame, wherein a loop line is established through the electrically

conductive member and the electrically conductive frame, said loop line having a length different from a wavelength of a driving signal supplied to the display panel or set smaller than a half of the wavelength (col. 5, lines 50-61) of the driving signal (**as recited in claim 3**).

Re claim 4, Nagai discloses (col. 5, lines 50-61) electric joints 22 being established between the electrically conductive member and the electrically conductive frame at positions spaced by intervals smaller than a quarter wavelength of the driving signal.

Re claim 5, Nagai discloses (col. 5, lines 50-61) the loop line being set smaller than a quarter wavelength of the driving signal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose et al. (“Momose”) JP 11-249111 (of record) in view of Yoshinaga.

Momose discloses 1-3 a display panel module comprising a display panel 10 defining a screen on a front surface; an electrically conductive frame 31/33 enclosing the display panel; and an electrically conductive member 32 located behind the display panel and electrically connected to the electrically conductive frame, but does not specifically disclose a loop line.

Yoshinaga discloses a loop line having a length different from a wavelength of a driving signal supplied to the display panel or set smaller than a half of the wavelength (paragraph bridging cols. 4 and 5) of the driving signal (as recited in claim 3).

Therefore, in view of Yoshinaga's teachings, one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be motivated to modify Momose by incorporating a loop line. The motivation would have been to improve light transmittance as taught by Yoshinaga (col. 4, lines 32-37).

Re claim 5, Yoshinaga discloses (paragraph bridging cols. 4 and 5) the loop line being set smaller than a quarter wavelength of the driving signal.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagai.

Nagai discloses the device structure as recited in the claim including electric joints being established between the electrically conductive member and the electrically conductive frame at positions spaced by intervals smaller than a quarter wavelength of the driving signal, but does not specifically disclose an interval smaller than one eighth of a wavelength. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have met the recited limitation since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

8. Claims 9-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of Yoshinaga.

Momose discloses 1-3 a display panel module comprising a display panel 10 defining a screen on a front surface; a panel-shaped module component (20-23) superposed on rear surface of the display panel; an electrically conductive frame 31/33 enclosing the display panel and

panel-shaped module component; and an electrically conductive member 32 located behind the display panel and electrically connected to the electrically conductive frame, but does not specifically disclose a loop line.

Yoshinaga discloses a loop line having a length different from a wavelength of a driving signal supplied to the display panel or set smaller than a half of the wavelength (paragraph bridging cols. 4 and 5) of the driving signal (as recited in claim 11).

Therefore, in view of Yoshinaga's teachings, one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be motivated to modify Momose by incorporating a loop line. The motivation would have been to improve light transmittance as taught by Yoshinaga (col. 4, lines 32-37).

Re claim 9, Momose discloses said display panel 10, said module component (20-23) and said electrically conductive frame 31/33 form a display panel module.

Re claim 13, Yoshinaga discloses (paragraph bridging cols. 4 and 5) the loop line being set smaller than a quarter wavelength of the driving signal.

9. Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of Yoshinaga as applied to claims 10, 11 and 13 above, and further in view of Nagai.

The combined references disclose the device structure as recited in the claim, but do not disclose electric joints spaced by intervals.

Nagai discloses (col. 5, lines 50-61) electric joints 22 being established between electrically conductive member 16 and electrically conductive frame 20 at positions spaced by intervals smaller than a quarter wavelength of the driving signal.

Therefore, in view of Nagai's teachings, one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be motivated to modify the device by incorporating electric joints spaced by intervals smaller than a quarter wavelength of the driving signal. The motivation would have been to prevent electromagnetic interference as taught by Nagai.

Re claim 14, Nagai discloses electric joints 22 being established between the electrically conductive member and the electrically conductive frame at positions spaced by intervals smaller than a quarter wavelength of the driving signal, but does not specifically disclose a loop line smaller than one eighth of a wavelength. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have met the recited limitation since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. Sefer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1921.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Purvis can be reached on (571) 272-1236.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANS
June 5, 2007



A. Sefer
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2826